

EXHIBIT 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NET JUMPER SOFTWARE, L.L.C.,
a Michigan limited liability
corporation,

Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAC-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 2 of 2
Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 04-70366-CV
Hon. Julian Abele Cook

vs.

Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen

GOOGLE INC.,
a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

/

DEPOSITION OF JOSEPH HARDIN

The Deposition of JOSEPH HARDIN taken before Eileen
S. Higer, Notary Public in the County of Oakland, in the above-
entitled cause on Friday, September 16, 2005, at 2000 Town Center,
Suite 900, Southfield, Michigan, commencing at about 8:00 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff	GARY HOOD, ESQUIRE
Net Jumper Software	WILLIAM F. WARD, ESQUIRE
	for: MICHAEL H. BANIAK, ESQUIRE
	Baniak, Pine & Gannon
	150 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1200 Chicago,
	Illinois 60606

For the Defendant	JASON W. WOLFF, ESQUIRE
Google, Inc.	Fish & Richardson, P.C.
	12390 El Camino Real
	San Diego, CA 92130-2081

Reported by:	Eileen Higer (CSMR 5018)
	Lori Caretti & Associates (568) 415-9008

D E X

PAGE:

WITNESS:

JOSEPH HARDIN

Examination by Mr. Wolf 164

Examination by Mr. Wolf 164

EXHIBITS:

Deposition Exhibit Number 95 4

Deposition Exhibit Number 96 84

Deposition Exhibit Number 97 113

Southfield, Michigan

Friday, September 16, 2005

At about 8:30 a.m.

Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAC-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 4 of 4

J O S E P H H A R D I N ,

having been duly sworn was examined upon his oath and
testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOOD:

Q Please state your name and spell your last name for the
court reporter.

A Joseph Hardin, H-a-r-d-i-n.

Q Mr. Hardin, what is your current business address?

A University of Michigan.

Q That's good enough.

1 understanding of the content of that history? In other
2 words if a court rules is it something that I have to say,
3 okay in contradiction to my understanding and my reading

4 of the rest of this these documents, I'll have to use
~~Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAG-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 5 of 5~~

5 that in drawing my conclusions?

6 Q I can't give you advice. You'll probably want to talk to
7 counsel about that, but let's assume that's what the law
8 said. That you had to use --

9 MR. WOLFF: Object to form. You can answer
10 the question. I think that that is what you said he's
11 saying, is that he's saying okay, so the court said that
12 within these four corners that is the thing. Are those
13 buttons separate from the -- from what the court has
14 construed that element to be, and even though it
15 contradicts everything you read in the thing, and your --
16 the basis of your opinion, if you just say that that is in
17 fact the case are those -- Counsel, you ask the question.

18 I don't want to ask my own witness the question.

19 MR. HOOD: That's what I tried to say. Yeah.

20 THE WITNESS: I think I'm understanding it
21 now. And if you want to ask the question again I'll

22 Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAC-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 6 of 6
answer it.

23 MR. HOOD: Yeah, let me do that.

24 BY MR. HOOD:

25 Q Assuming that the court were to say, Professor, that the

1 page display as you've defined it in tab C to your
2 declaration were the search window, as that term is used
3 in the claims of the '172 patent, would it still be your
4 [Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAC-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 7 of 7](#)
opinion that the Next & Previous buttons were not

5 separately displayed from the search window?

6 MR. WOLFF: Object to form with all the
7 caveats the witness had previously testified. Go ahead
8 and answer the question.

9 THE WITNESS: Yeah. If that was an absolute
10 statement and -- then I would have to conclude that the
11 Next & Previous buttons as they're displayed in Exhibit C
12 would be separate from the display page.

13 BY MR. HOOD:

14 Q They would be separately displayed from the display page,
15 correct?

16 A Yes.

1 move around in that and investigate that space in that
2 fashion.

3 Q How would a user navigate using CyberPilot?

4 A [Case 2:04-cv-70366-JAC-RSW Document 54-12 Filed 09/27/2005 Page 8 of 10](#)
5 In a similar fashion. In the distinction in the case of

6 CyberPilot would be that if I knew a starting point, for
7 instance, that I wanted to go to, I would be able to type
8 that into a form window, a URL window and use that as the
9 starting point for my search.

10 Q Is there any way in which a user of CyberPilot could enter
11 a search query, a number of search terms, not a URL but a
12 search query and actually search a network, a computer
13 network?

14 MR. WOLFF: Object to form. Calls for a
15 narrative.

16 THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.

BY MR. HOOD:

17 Q Turning, Professor, to Exhibit D to your declaration,
18 particularly the second page there. Does this particular
19 page, Exhibit D to your declaration show what you consider
20 to be the search window as we've used that term in claim 1
21 of the '172 patent?

22 A Here it is labeled as the browser window, and the answer
23 is yes.

24 Q Browser window 400 --

25 A Yes.